

ER 61-134/a

✓ 9 FEB 1961

Mr. Jesse W. Bollinger *Conroy*

STAT

Dear Mr. Bollinger:

Thank you for your recent letter and
your essay, "The Story of Democracy".

I have noted them with interest, and
I appreciate your motives in writing me on
this subject.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

Allen W. Dulles
Director

STAT

O/DCI/ [redacted] :kp(2/6/61)

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee

1 - DCI

1 - ER (w/basic)

1 - Col. Grogan

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE B)

Executive Registry
1/1-134

JESSE W. BOLLINGER
ATTORNEY AT LAW

TELEPHONE
LOGAN 3-6260

921 HOWARD STREET
DEARBORN 7, MICHIGAN

Jan.
2nd
1961

Mr. Allen W. Dulles,
Director of Central Intelligence
Central Intelligence Agency
2430 E Street
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Dulles:

In the address attributed to you and published in the December Reader's Digest, you very critically take Americans to task because "too many" of them ".... lulled by wishful thinking, grasp at every soviet whim.."

Your article demonstrates that you can "dish it out", but the real test of character, as you know, is: Can you take it? This I would like to know, so here goes.

You may not consider yourself to be lulled by wishful thinking, but I believe that I can show that you are guilty of dangerously wrong thinking. Thinking which serves Moscow's purposes far more than those of your own country.

You practically demand that Americans be taught all about "Communists" and "Communism". Let us see what this leads to. A high school student, for example, reads your article and agrees with you. However, in order to be very sure that he will understand perfectly what "Communism" means, he decides to memorize its definition as found in his dictionary. If he repeated this definition once for every time the word appears in your article, this or something quite similar, is what he would read to himself approximately 28 times: Communism. The doctrine that property and the means of production should be under community control. He would find "Communist" defined as one who believes in Communism.

Now what would you say, Mr. Dulles, if our high school student should ask you to explain what is wrong, subversive, or illegal about Communism as his dictionary defines it? You would be obliged to tell him that there is really nothing at all wrong, subversive or illegal about this word as thus defined. You would also be obliged to admit that not one of Russia's leaders (whom you call Communists) believes in, or practices Communism as thus defined, and for a very good reason. They could not put this dictionary definition of communism into actual practice in Russia without turning over control of the country to the people. This, of course, would necessitate their relinquishing control themselves, and you know very well they will never do this until they are forced to.

All of which brands you, Mr. Dulles, as one frantically advocating that Americans learn all about Russian Communism, notwithstanding that those whom you call "Communists" do not believe in it, and would not dare to practice it if they did believe in it. You, however, call these same men "dedicated" communists, and you criticise the rest of us for not agreeing with you.

Should you attempt, at this point, to say that by "Communism" you do not mean the dictionary definition, then the very least you could do to rescue our high-school student from his utter confusion, would be to let him know your definition, so he would understand that his dictionary is wrong and should be corrected.

The unfortunate and tragic truth, Mr. Dulles, is that by calling Russia's leaders "Communists", you help them achieve their greatest and most important propaganda objective. As a sort of American Master of Ceremonies for them, and by your gratuitous admission that they are "communists", you present them to the world attractively garbed in a dignified ideological mantle. You thus achieve what is truly a masterpiece of deceit. By agreeing with Russia's leaders that they really are Communists, you provide these wolves with the ideological sheep's clothing which is so necessary to their existence, because without this, they would stand before the world exposed for what they really are: Despotic usurpers; no more and no less.

The thing that makes Russia's rulers virtually world criminals, is simply the fact that they are usurpers. They know that in taking this position, democracy, ipso facto, became their natural enemy. Having thus taken the position that their right to rule is not legally dependent upon the will of the people, they must pursue a policy of obstruction and subversion against democracy. They have no alternative. They must do this if only to save their own skins. But, Mr. Dulles, the fact that they must fight democracy to maintain their political position as despots, is hardly a justification for your saying that Khrushchev's policy of promoting war and treason makes him an ideologist and a communist.

Since neither you or anyone else, by any possible reasoning or stretch of the imagination, could every qualify Russia's rulers as "Communists" under any known definition of that word, you stand faced with another very embarrassing truth, to-wit: The one and only reason existing as a justification for calling these men "Communists", is that their propaganda demands it. Think that over. You may try to find another reason but you will be wasting your time. There is none. And to think that you accuse others of fuzzy thinking.

After having read your article in the Digest, Mr. Dulles, you will forgive me if I doubt that you could understand the enclosed article, even if you were game enough to read it; but I can tell you this: If you did succeed in understanding it, you would be well equipped to write another article which would be of real benefit to you and your country. This next article could be entitled : "We will never be able to sell Democracy to the world until we understand it ourselves."

The bitter irony of it. You advocate teaching our school children about Russian Communism, which does not exist, and your views are widely published as being authoritative and most valuable. I advocate teaching them about Democracy, the nature and meaning of which, as a nation, we are tragically ignorant, and my suggestion is ignored and rejected as not being at all worthwhile.

Very truly yours,



JESSE W. BOLLINGER

JWB:jg.
c-c to Reader's Digest

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. DULLES

This is for your information.

The letter from Mr. Bollinger is a clue to his thinking processes. The attached essay, addressed to the Lawyers of America chastises ~~the~~ them for failing to deal with the right issue in the world today, -- the conflict between majority rule and minority rule. I cannot recommend your reading it.

Attached is suggested letter to
Mr. Bollinger for your signature.

WE
WE 30 Jan 61
(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

TO THE LAWYERS OF AMERICA:

Perhaps the most important obligation of the American Bar is its duty to advance our knowledge of the science of government, and to make that knowledge available to all.

In performing this most important duty the American Bar has failed miserably. A world in desperate need of an elementary and basic knowledge of governments, is given instead, innocuous platitudes. This, at a time when a few fundamental truths about the science, nature and history of government, if made known and fully explained, would demonstrate conclusively that democratic government is the only form of government under which the best hopes of mankind can ever be realized. These truths are not being made known or explained, and for this the Bar must accept full responsibility.

The American Bar, without objection, has permitted Russia to frame the issue to be tried, and the agenda to be followed for carrying on the cold war.

[REDACTED] We have agreed, that today's world political struggle is a contest between Communism and democracy, notwithstanding that such a contest is utterly, totally and completely impossible. (A capital "C" and a small "d" have been used because this is what I find in my dictionary.)

The American Bar has not only failed to explain that Communism and democracy are totally different things, which cannot even be intelligently compared with each other, it has actually taken sides in this farcical controversy.

Today's world struggle is no more and no less than the age old struggle which has been going on for centuries, between two utterly different and irreconcilable forms of government:- Majority Rule and Minority Rule. The struggle for survival between these two forms of government is now and always will be the major political strife in the world, pending the ultimate and inevitable triumph of Majority Rule. Abraham Lincoln clearly expressed the issue involved in this struggle a hundred years ago in the simple question: Shall government of the people, by the people and for the people survive, or shall it perish from the earth? This is the question, and the only question, involved in today's cold war. What a pity that the hundreds of defectors to Russia did not know this.

But, do we demand that the propaganda war of words be confined to the real issue? No, we do not, because we have agreed that Communism is the issue, and accordingly it must be the central theme of all discussion concerning the cold war. The real issue involved is thus side tracked, and Abraham Lincoln's ideology of government by the people relegated to the limbo of forgotten dreams. Our shame in permitting this to happen is the more tragic because of two very embarrassing facts: Communism could exist under Majority Rule, but it could not and does not exist under Russian Minority Rule.

One final observation to further show how far our thinking has been wrong: Government by the people can never be irrevocably committed either for or against Communism or any other legislative policy. The very term "Majority Rule" precludes such commitment. The majority must always be able to revoke any legislative policy, whether it be Communism or any other, otherwise there is no Majority Rule.

The people look to the learned profession of the law for the truth and for guidance in world policies. It is hoped that the enclosed article will help American Lawyers to realize to some degree the enormity of the betrayal of this trust.

JESSE W. BOLLINGER

THE STORY OF DEMOCRACY

It is popularly believed that the most important difference between the United States and Russia is that in this country property is privately owned, while in Russia it is owned by the government. It may come something as a surprise to many of us to learn that this is not the basic difference, or even an important difference, between these two countries.

In all countries the revenue of the government and that of the people comes from the same source; namely, what people are able to produce and create through their industry and utilization of the country's resources and raw materials.

Methods used to collect the government's revenue vary in different countries. For instance, the United States method differs greatly from that of Russia but in both countries all property in a very practical sense is owned by the government. To illustrate: Who would you say is the owner of a piece of property on which you live and which you use as your own, but for which you must pay rent to someone who could take it away from you if you failed to pay the rent? The answer is pretty obvious, that the one to whom the rent is paid is the owner. Now would it make any real difference in this factual situation if, instead of calling the payments rent, we called them taxes? Any difference, to say the least, is purely academic.

The methods employed by a government to control property or collect operating revenue are matters of internal domestic policy which have practically no importance in international relations. The Russian government is not sacrificing a better standard of living for its people in favor of a vast military establishment because it dislikes our domestic policies, and we are not putting an annual 40 billions for defense into our national budget because we disapprove of Russia's domestic policies of property control.

What then is the reason for the cold war? What is the great fundamental difference between our countries which is responsible for this constant international tension?

We are told from our schools, from the pulpits, and from the State Department that "Communism" is to blame; that the world is faced with an inevitable and ultimate choice between Communism and Democracy. Fortunately this is not true, because a choice between communism and democracy not only does not

exist, it cannot exist.

Communism is pretty generally defined as a Social or Economic Theory pertaining to the common ownership of property. Democracy is defined as a Form of Government, the basic characteristic of which is that it employs the principle of Majority Rule in arriving at political decisions. Now how can a Social or Economic theory be chosen in preference to a Form of Government? The answer is that this is impossible. They are totally different things. One could become a law if it were adopted by the other, but the law establishing communism could hardly be chosen in preference to the form of government which adopted the law. Nevertheless, this is the blind alley into which Russian propaganda has led us, and the crowning ignominy of it all is the further fact that communism does not even exist in Russia.

Why doesn't communism exist in Russia? Simply because it can exist only in a democracy. This also is one of those little obvious truths, too insignificant perhaps to be noticed, but it is obvious and it is true. Mere government control and ownership of property is not necessarily communism. It is communism only (according to our dictionary definition) if such control is by the people. However, the only way the people or anyone else can exercise such control is through the government. Consequently, if the people are to control the country's property they must first get control of the government, and they control the government only in a democracy. Thus by the simplest of reasoning we see that communism is possible only in a democracy.

The idea of the government seizing all property is not at all original with Russia's present day rulers, or their predecessors. This idea was thoroughly exploited nearly 900 years ago by William II of England. Credit for the idea, if it can be called credit, is given to William's Minister, Ralph Flambard, who is described as a diabolically clever exponent of Machivellian principles with a subtle and malignant brain. Today he would fit perfectly into the Russian political machine, and Russia's leaders would not doubt hail him as a completely dedicated disciple of communism.

Under Flambard's "ideology" all of England belonged to William; the land, the woods, the waters, the wild game, the beasts of the fields, all revenues --- everything. In William's (socialist) state, private property did not exist. All land was "loanland" and could not be willed to the members of a man's family. On his death it went back to the King (the State) who was everybody's heir.

Looking back at the political state ruled over by William II, it would seem that he must have been the world's first "communist". Through the telescope of time we are able to see the true nature of William's era much more clearly than we are able to see the true nature of the present Russian era. Historians now describe William's governmental theories and practices as the most diabolically ingenious devices for aiding tyranny ever conceived by the mind of man. The same theories and devices are being practiced in present day Russia, but they are attributed to an ideology and called "communism". William had something else in common with the Russian rulers of today which may or may not be of any particular significance - he was called "the Red", --- "Rufus the Red".

It is said that great minds discuss principles, ordinary minds discuss events, and small minds discuss people.

History can be discussed and considered as a parade of people --- of kings and clowns, noble and commoner, arrayed in quaint and varied costumes, traipsing down the centuries. It can also be considered as a cold chronological record of events, dates, dynasties and wars, or it can be viewed as disclosing the triumphs and failures of fundamental and immutable principles of life, of government, and of human character.

If we are but willing to consider history from this latter viewpoint, we will find that it not only explains completely the nature and cause of today's cold war, but that it also tells us how this conflict must ultimately be resolved.

Today's world struggle is by no means new. In fact it is very old. It is a struggle between two forms of government, and basically there are but two --- Majority Rule and Minority Rule. Unfortunately the two are totally incompatible and mutually deny the validity of each other. The rulers of Russia cannot possibly concede that Majority Rule is a proper and acceptable form of government because such an admission would be a virtual denial of their own right to rule. As Lincoln himself said, "No government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination"; and acceptance of Majority Rule by the Russian government would practically guarantee that government's termination. Similarly, we cannot possibly admit that Minority Rule is a proper form of government because to do so would be to deny everything we have written into our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence.

Among the large countries of the modern world the struggle between Majority Rule and Minority Rule began in England, the Mother of Parliaments. It began with the King consulting with men from different parts of the Realm to assist in the

collection and enforcement of feudal levies. It was necessary that these men speak the language of the people which the Norman kings and their nobility did not. The advice and opinions of the group of King's councilors came to be an accepted part of the Law of the Land, so much so that taxes eventually came to be considered illegal if not approved by them. Thus did Parliament, the voice of the people, have its beginning. Eventually it became an integral part of English law, and thus did the English people first experience self-government.

On the continent of Europe, unfortunately, no such happy development took place. Feudalism smothered it, and the dissatisfaction of the people with their rulers found expression only in disorganized violence.

In France the famous French Revolution occurred in 1789, but the French people lacked one of the essential ingredients of a successful people's government; they were not yet capable of governing themselves. The result was unfortunate but inevitable; France reverted to Minority Rule and literally struggled along under this type of government from Napoleon to the advent of the Third Republic. A truly representative government did not come into existence in France until 1877, nearly a hundred years after the Revolution.

In Italy good progress was made by the people toward self-government in the 19th century largely through the efforts of some great statesmen, notable among whom was Count Camilla Cavour, but their progress was not good enough. The people of Italy in 1923 were still incapable of taking over their own government. The government of Italy at that time being weak, the inevitable "power vacuum" resulted. Mussolini seized the opportunity to fill the power void, just as Napoleon had done in France. The inevitable happened to Mussolini, and the people of Italy at last have government by the people.

In 1848 in Europe there was a great surge of feeling among the people for self-government. One result of this was the Frankfort Parliament, called for the purpose of establishing self-government for the peoples of Central Europe. Concerning this Parliament, Prof. H. E. Barnes has this to say: "In Germany and Central Europe the tragedy of the failure of the liberal movement of 1848 can scarcely be exaggerated. This meant that German unity was not to be accomplished under the benevolent auspices of the liberals of the Frankfort Parliament, but under the autocracy (Minority Rule) represented by Bismarck, who, after he created the German empire, was able to throttle all subsequent attempts to make it a democratic nation. Thus

established, this regime could not be ousted by any measures short of war." The eventual and inevitable result was World War I. After the war, a completely democratic form of government was set up in Germany. The people of Germany, however, like the people of France and Italy, were not ready for self-government and the resulting power void was filled by Hitler. Now democratic government has been established in West Germany, and it is probably there to stay.

Historians have called the struggle of the people for self-government a fight against the "Old Regime", referring, of course, to the royal sovereigns, but with the removal of royalty, and with the people not yet fully capable of governing themselves, opportunists in France, Italy, Germany and Russia took over the government and became private rulers without benefit of royal right or public election. Minority Rule thus became re-established in all of these countries, with the discouraging result that the struggle of the people for government by the people had to begin all over again. The people learned, to their sorrow, that the evils inherent in, and incident to, Minority Rule attach to revolutionary dictators as well as hereditary monarchs, and that a revolution against Minority Rule which does not result in establishing Majority Rule succeeds only in creating the need for another revolution. The people of France made no political progress by deposing Louis XVI and installing Napoleon in his place. The people of Germany gained nothing for themselves by eliminating Kaiser Wilhelm II and putting Hitler in his place. The Russian people found themselves to be the same political puppets under Stalin as they had been under Czar Nicholas II. As political phenomena, all of these historical characters are absolutely the same. As champions of Minority Rule they become identical obstructions in the path of the people's progress toward democracy.

At present the slow but inexorable advance of democracy from West to East across the face of Europe has again come to a temporary halt, necessitated by the usual challenge from entrenched forces of Minority Rule. This time it is in Russia and the satellite countries.

The Russian revolution occurred in 1917. (The story is acquiring a familiar ring.) The people of Russia, like the people of France, Italy and Germany, were not ready to govern themselves. Out of the resulting scramble to fill the power void Stalin emerged successful. On Stalin's death there was another scramble from which Khrushchev has come off the winner. How much time may elapse between the

revolution and the day when true government by the people is established in Russia still remains to be determined. Unfortunately, it may be much longer than we would like. There are two reasons for this. The first is that education has a long way to go to ready the Russian people for the responsibilities of self-government. The second is that Russian propaganda has proved to be an extraordinary powerful deterrent to democracy, and a most effective device for maintaining the power of the Russian rulers. According to this propaganda, the Russian people want "communism" and they and their rulers are engaged in a great world crusade to establish their "ideology" in the decadent democracies. This is probably the worst hoax ever perpetrated on mankind in the history of the world. Perhaps the one most damaging effect of this propaganda is that we have been induced to believe that today's world struggle and cold war is the impossible one between communism and democracy.

So much for Russia, and the development of European democracies. What about democracy in the new world? To recount fully this development would be repetitious. We have seen how completely the success of democratic government is dependent on the political enlightenment of the people. We have recently witnessed the tragic effect of the instability of government in Argentina, Venezuela and Cuba, the reason, as always, being the inability of the people to maintain a government of their own. There is no way for the people to avoid the tragic consequences of not being able to govern themselves, but this we know. It would be a cruel hoax to blame their plight on an ideology.

We in the United States have been very fortunate. Our revolution, contrary to popular belief, did not give us freedom, it only gave us independence. Our freedom is the gift of our forefathers of 1776, who not only formed our government but proved to the world that they were capable of making it work. In this, their Anglo-Saxon heritage was of inestimable value.

Our national anthem begins with this question: "Oh, say can you see.....", but if we Americans do not see in that "star-spangled banner" infinitely more than our country's flag, we are indeed blind. Along with the flags of all free nations, Old Glory is the proud emblem of the greatest of all popular achievements --- government by the people. It is the mark of a country where the people have politically come "of age"; where they have proven that they are capable of governing themselves.

Russian propaganda to the contrary, our flag is not a symbol of capitalism or of any other "ism". It carries no words or legend to make known its plain and simple meaning for mankind but, if it did, the words could only be " THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY IS THE LAW OF THIS LAND".

The story of democracy is the story of the struggle of the peoples of the world, first, to gain their independence, and, second, to learn to govern themselves. It is also a story concerning which our lack of understanding amounts to a national tragedy. To us all democracy is still a mystery, as was pointed out by the editor of a national magazine in a note written on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday. The editor stated that "His(Lincoln's) acts and utterances.....are taken the world over as the best personal key to the mysteries of democracy and popular government." Where better, indeed, can we look for an understanding of democracy than to Mr. Lincoln.

Nikita Khrushchev recently voiced the prediction that whether we in this country like it or not, our children or our grandchildren will be living under a socialistic system. What would Abraham Lincoln say to that? Mr. Lincoln would reply probably in words like this: "I doubt, Mr. Khrushchev, that your prediction will come true but, if it does, you may be quite sure it will be because the people themselves voted for it." His reply would be that simple and probably that brief. It would point straight to the only important difference there is between the government of the United States and that of Russia; namely, that our government is responsible to all of the people and the Russian government is responsible to only a few. Mr. Lincoln would not scoff at Mr. Khrushchev's professed belief in socialism or communism. He would not scoff at anyone's belief. It is unlikely, however, that he would be able to resist delivering a verbal thrust at the absurdity of the Russians claiming to have established a "Peoples Democratic Republic", while denying the people's right to control it. Mr. Lincoln would point out that the Russian rulers simply contradict themselves.

Because they claim for themselves the right to make their peculiar version of communism a permanent national policy without regard for the wishes of the people, and because they insist that they alone have the right to be the country's rulers whether the people approve or not, Russia's leaders have found themselves in the infamous position of having to establish a large and powerful police force, not to ensure and safeguard democratic processes, but to suppress and destroy them. Their problem is simple, they must destroy democracy or democracy will destroy them.

However, any study of the nature of government should begin at the beginning and the very first thing which must be learned about government is that the first duty and responsibility of any government is not the welfare of the people, but the preservation of the government itself. This is a fundamental law and it is as immutable as the law of gravitation. It operates with the same force and authority under Minority Rule as under Majority Rule. It must be recognized and obeyed in dictatorships as well as in democracies. Consequently, many rights guaranteed the people in a democracy as basic and fundamental cannot be permitted under Minority Rule because they violate this law, they endanger the existance of the government. Among such rights are Freedom of Speech, Freedom of the Press, and the right to own property.

Freedom of Speech poses no threat or danger to the government of the United States because here the people are also the government but in Russia, full Freedom of Speech could result in public criticism of, opposition to, and possibly the overthrow of, the government. Full Freedom of Speech as a national policy is thus impossible in Russia and its suppression is completely justifiable legally because, remember, the government comes first --- it must be preserved at all costs.

The same is true of Freedom of the Press. We well know in this country how widespread publicity, through the medium of the press, can ruin the careers of politicians. To attack the politicians who rule Russia, however, would be an attack on the government and, therefore, treason. If the government must be preserved at all costs, which it unquestionably must, we are forced to agree with Russia's rulers that full Freedom of the Press cannot possibly be permitted in that country.

The threat and danger to the Russian government inherent in Freedom of Speech and Freedom of the Press would likewise exist, to a degree at least, in a policy of permitting private enterprise and private ownership of property. Private enterprise in the field of commerce and industry results not only in a freedom and independence as concerns the individual's private economy, but it also provides the individual with considerable independent power and influence, which could be exerted in a manner not in the best interest of Russia's permanently entrenched politicians. Because of this, one wonders if we are not just a bit naive in accepting at face value the Russian government's claim that its policy of taking control of that country's property is prompted solely from ideological motives rather than by the more practical consideration of self-preservation.

In any event, I think even these few comparisons will suffice to prove that one need not be a psychiatrist to see the hopeless conflict which exists between Majority Rule and Minority Rule. The conflict, however, is heavily weighted against Russia's rulers. Arrayed opposite them is the overwhelming power of the people. Unfortunately, minority rulers do not willingly resign, even when they no longer enjoy the favor of the people. When this happens, the only recourse of the people is revolution and, to those in control under a dictatorship, it is never a question of will there be a revolution, it is only a question of when. They live under the constant threat of this inevitable eventuality and, if they are smart, as they usually are, they always presume it to be imminent. They will stop at nothing, however, to prevent it, which is understandable since their lives literally depend on their being able to prevent it. This means that to forestall the day of their downfall as long as possible, Russia's rulers will entrench themselves behind an iron curtain. They will distort and suppress the truth. They will purge, kill, lie and cheat. They will claim that democracy is decadent and proclaim that "international communism" will dominate the world. They know what they must do, and they do it.

The wonder is not that Russia's rulers will commit any crime in the book, if necessary, to safeguard themselves, the wonder is that we glorify their doing it with the weird explanation that it is an ideology expressing itself. It hardly seems possible that we could be so unrealistic as to believe that the Russian rulers are primarily, or even seriously concerned about communism or any ideology, except to consider the possibilities it might have for helping them stay in power. We know that every move of the Russian leaders, every statement they make, and every thought they have is directed first to the only real problem they have, which is their own survival. Why, then, do we ascribe their motives to communism? One reason, already mentioned, is that they themselves claim to act in the name of communism and we have accepted the claim. Another reason is that the publicists to whom we look for explanations and guidance in such matters have been teaching us about communism instead of democracy.

Shortly before its demise, the Woman's Home Companion published an article announcing the intention of promoting a program of teaching America all about communism. The title was "The Lessons Our Schools Don't Teach".

In an article in a national magazine, the National Commander of the American Legion expressed the sincere wish that Americans could learn more about communism. The title of his article was "We Must Teach The Truth About Communism".

J. Edgar Hoover has written profusely, entertainingly, and it is presumed authoritatively about communism and communists.

Some time ago the official magazine of the American Bar Association

*Addl
Mr. Dulles* carried an exhaustive treatise on the communist teachings of Karl Marx.

These are a few examples, but only a few Practically every editor, radio commentator, author, clergyman or politician who undertakes to discuss Russia's rulers speaks of them as "communists", it being conclusively presumed that they are communists. The ideology of these rulers is always more or less vehemently deplored in such discussions, it being agreed by everyone (except possibly the people of Russia) that they are motivated by an ideology.

Unfortunately, the Russian rulers do not qualify as "communists" under the definition of the word as found in any dictionary. According to my dictionary a communist is one who subscribes to the belief that all property and means of production should be under "community control"; communities, that is, which are "self-governed". The Russian rulers do not allow any community in their country to control anything and they do not, and cannot, permit self-government.

In any event, one thing is certain. We find no promise of the ultimate triumph of government by the people in this endless advertising of communism. Happily, however, such promise is not entirely lacking. Strangely enough, a sure sign of the eventual triumph of democracy over dictatorships, of Majority Rule over Minority Rule, is given to us by the dictators themselves. We find it in Hitler's haranguing of the people from his Sports Palace, in Mussolini's spellbinding from his balcony, and in Stalin's Iron Curtain and propaganda control, all of which are telltale admissions by these rulers that the sovereign power of the State really resides in the people. If this were not so, the passionate appeals to the people would be entirely unnecessary. Napoleon did very little talking to his people, but he acknowledged their inherent sovereign authority when he said that he feared three newspapers more than ten thousand bayonets.

As a result of the political awakening of the people in the years following Napoleon, dictatorships have become increasingly difficult to establish. In the 20th century Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin all found it quite necessary to have a "Propaganda Smoke Screen", a good sales talk, that is, with which to hoodwink the people while they proceeded to take over the government. For this purpose they all created a "cause" to fight for. Mussolini called his cause "Fascism", Hitler called

not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people?", he asked, "Is there any better or equal hope in the world?" He continued his plea: "Unanimity is impossible," he said, "the rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left." That last observation should be repeated over and over again in every school room in this land: ". . . rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left." Today we disagree with Mr. Lincoln; we agree with Russia; we say that rejecting Majority Rule, what is left is an ideology and we call it communism.

In the Gettysburg address Mr. Lincoln again made his plea for universal acceptance of the principle of Majority Rule. When he expressed his fervent hope for the preservation of government of the people, by the people, and for the people he was pleading with his fellow citizens never to abandon this principle. But if we believe all that we hear today we might be convinced that the closing words of Mr. Lincoln's address were wrong. That the government he should have hoped and prayed would not perish from the earth is "government of the people (except those who believe in communism, socialism, etc.), by the people (except those who believe in communism, socialism, etc.), and for the people (the same)." Abraham Lincoln's profound and abiding faith in the Majority principle convinced him, as it should convince us, that government of the people is not endangered by the right of people freely to express themselves, the danger lies rather in denying this right. Differences in individual beliefs, opinions, and ideologies are the very stuff of which a strong and virile nation is made; if, along with Abraham Lincoln, we are but willing to bow to the will of the majority with ". . . a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people," knowing that there is indeed no ". . . better or equal hope in the world."

History teaches us another lesson: That Majority Rule is not a mere political expedient. Professor Harvey James Robinson says it ". . . implies a type of social organization which will develop to the fullest extent the latent potentialities of every member of society, and it imposes upon society the moral obligation to do

everything in its power to hasten the realization of such a state of affairs."

In fact it is not at all difficult to incline to the belief that Majority Rule enjoys a divine blessing, since it is the only means provided by nature, God, or man for peacefully exercising the God-given sovereign power of the whole people, and, paradoxically, it is really rule by minorities. Every individual vote when it is cast is very much a minority vote. It becomes a majority vote only after all the votes have been counted. The only thing certain under Majority Rule is that many of those winning with the majority today, will be losing with the minority tomorrow. A more perfect arrangement than this for preventing exploitation of the people cannot be imagined.

We can be very thankful, however, that the benefits which we can provide for ourselves under Majority Rule are not entirely lost because all who have the right to vote do not do so. If we do not vote, the blessings of Majority Rule are only proportionately lost. The body politic does not die because we fail to discharge this responsibility of citizenship, it just becomes partially paralyzed.

By: Jesse W. Bollinger



STAT